



R E P L Y,

ON *the Part of the PROPRIETORS of the ANGLESEA
COPPER and LEAD-MINES, to a Paper called an
Answer to their CASE.*

THOUGH it must be apparent to every judicious and candid Reader of the *pretend-
ed* Answer to the Case of the Proprietors of the Anglesea Mines, that the Persons in-
terested in drawing it up had no other View but to throw Impediments in the
Way of a Bill brought into Parliament upon Principles of Public Utility, and supported in
its Progress by the real Friends to the general commercial Prosperity of the Kingdom,
“Without Favour or Partiality to any Body of Men in this or that Country;” yet it is
incumbent on the Petitioners for the Bill, to obviate the very few *plausible* and *equivocal* Ob-
jections thereby scattered here and there throughout this vague Production.

By Reference to the Anglesea Case, it will be found that the Petitioners for the Bill have
two distinct Objects, for which they solicit a Drawback of the Duties upon Coals. *The
First is*, to be exempt from the Duties to which they are now liable upon Coals for *smelting
their Ores*. *The Second*, to obtain the same Exemption for the Coals they may hereafter
consume for working Fire-Engines.—Privileges which the *Cornish* and *Devonshire* Mines have
enjoyed upwards of *Forty-two Years*.

Finding it impossible to controvert the Equity and sound Policy “of giving equal En-
couragement and Advantages, without Partiality or Distinction, to all His Majesty’s Sub-
jects engaged in laudable Undertakings, calculated to promote the *Arts, Manufactures,*
“and *Commerce* of the Kingdom,” the Compilers of the Answer have not presumed to
advance a single Fact, or even the Shadow of an Argument, against the first Object of the
Bill, that of granting to the Anglesea Mines a Drawback upon Coals, for *smelting their
Ores*.

*that they re-
quire their Coals
Cheaper.*

The whole Force of their Objections is levelled against extending the same Indulgence to
the Anglesea Miners, for the Coals *they may hereafter use for working of Fire-Engines*.

After admitting that the same Encouragement which has made the Cornish Mines flour-
ish, ought to be extended to all other Copper Works in the Kingdom; they assert, that
the *Cornwall* and *Anglesea* Mines are not in other Respects upon an equal Footing; but the
only Instance in which they pretend to prove that the Cornish Miners require Privileges
which the others do not enjoy is,—the Difference of the Depth of the respective Mines;
many of those in Cornwall being one hundred and fifty Fathoms deep, whereas the Mines
in Anglesea are not more than thirty or forty Yards: The Depth of the Former, they say,
obliges them to employ *Twenty-one Fire-Engines*, at a very large Expence; whereas the
latter have not *one*, and from their present inconsiderable Depth, will not require *one* for
many Years; therefore it is concluded, that a Privilege equitable in itself should not be ex-
tended to them, because they do not immediately want it.

Independent of the Evidence given before the Committee of the House of Commons on
the Petition for the Bill, proving that the Anglesea Mines cannot be carried on without
Fire-Engines, the Futility of such reasoning is apparent;—for the Privilege of the Draw-
back, should it be granted by the present Bill, cannot be enjoyed till it is absolutely want-
ed, the Expence of erecting Fire-Engines (according to their own Account) being so
heavy, that the Anglesea Miners cannot think of erecting them till they can no longer do
without them. And as it is acknowledged in the Answer, that when any Mines absolutely
require Fire-Engines, the Drawback upon Coals consumed in working them ought to
be granted, as it was to the Cornish and Devonshire Miners in 1741; What Mischief can
possibly

possibly arise from granting both Objects *at this Time*, to the Proprietors of the Anglesea Mines, by one beneficent Act of the Legislature, instead of obliging them to make a future Application to Parliament for the second Object of their Prayer, which, besides interrupting the national Business, must occasion fresh and unnecessary Trouble and Fatigue to the Members.

It is allowed in the Answer, that the Interposition of Parliament in 1741, prevented the Failure of the Cornish Mines. It is on the same Grounds that a similar Indulgence is now requested for the Anglesea Mines; and surely the granting it by Way of Prevention is more humane and politic, than to suffer a considerable Undertaking, hitherto highly useful to the Public, to be overthrown for want of timely Assistance.

Neither can it be thought a reasonable Objection to the Bill, that the Proprietors of the Anglesea Mines, after having been the Means, by a laudable Competition, of reducing the Price of Copper at Market, and of serving the Navy, the East India Company, and the principal Manufactories in the Kingdom, on lower Terms than it could be obtained before their Mines were worked, should have reaped a moderate Profit;—for if by carrying the same Competition to a much greater Extent, in Consequence of the Encouragement solicited in the Bill, they can still further reduce the Price, and thereby increase not only the Exportation of the Metal, but of the Manufactures in which it is used, they will certainly deserve the Emoluments they may acquire. But they stedfastly deny that their Profits have been, or can be, immense or exorbitant, as is asserted amongst many other Things equally fallacious in the Answer.

And that the Public has already derived great Benefit from the reduced Price of Copper, is evinced by the Petition of the Birmingham Manufacturers, presented to the House of Commons in Favour of the Anglesea Bill.

It is alledged in the Answer, "That if the Debenture is granted to the Anglesea Miners, the Cornish Miners must stop, because they will not be able to bear any further Reduction of the Price of the Metal:" But this Allegation is not supported by any Evidence whatever; but proceeds solely upon a Misrepresentation of their Expences, and a total Inattention to the comparative View of the Expence of Coals in Anglesea and Cornwall, and of the Loss of Metal by calcining the Anglesea Ores in Kilns; both of which are annexed to the Anglesea Case.

On the contrary, the Anglesea Proprietors are ready to maintain, that if the Indulgences requested by the Bill are granted to them, and even if the Price of the Metal is by their Means reduced still 15 per Cent. lower, the Cornish Miners, from the richness of their Ores, and other Circumstances, will be enabled, notwithstanding, to carry on their Works, and to bring their Metal to Market as usual, and with a reasonable Profit.

But a Vein of Misrepresentation runs through the whole of their Paper, which would have rendered it unworthy of public Notice, if it had not closed with a Challenge to answer certain Queries, which gave Birth to this Reply, and occasioned the Introduction of the foregoing Remarks.

Nothing now remains but to quote their Queries, and to give a faithful, just, and candid Answer to each.

Query 1. Is the Situation of the Anglesea Mines any Thing like that of the Cornish Mines in 1741?

Ans. No, certainly, for it is much worse, the Cornish Miners enjoying at that Period, the Drawback upon Coals used in smelting their Ores, worth, on an Average, 15^l. per Ton; such as were worth only 9 or 10^l. were then called *low-priced Ores*; whereas the Anglesea Ores, on an Average, are now proved to be worth no more than 1^l. per Ton.

Q. 2. Do not the Anglesea Miners now raise and refine their Ores at a much less Expence than the Cornish Miners?

A. The raising, perhaps, may cost less, but not in Proportion to the Difference in the Value of the Ores. The Refining must cost considerably more than in Cornwall, on Account

very low
value of competition

vide Counter
petition.

It is
supported

It is here
corrected

more
than

count of the great Expence of Carriage, which the present Duty on Coals renders unavoidable.

Q. 3. Is it likely that the Anglesea Mines will require a Fire Engine in the Course of ten Years?

A. It has been proved before the Committee, that they may require those Machines very soon; but were it otherwise, it is no just Reason why they should be debarred the Indulgence they solicit; nor can the Cornish Gentlemen wish to prevent it, unless they want to recover a Monopoly. *a Monopoly is impossible*

Q. 4. Cannot the Anglesea Miners get their Coals cheaper in Anglesea, paying the Duty, than the Cornish Miners can get theirs, being allowed the Duty?

A. By no Means; the comparative Prices annexed to their Case clearly prove they cannot.

Q. 5. Cannot the Anglesea Miners carry their Ore to their Works at *Liverpool* at a much less Expence than any of the Cornish Copper Companies can theirs?

A. So far from it, that their Freight is nearly double that of the Cornish Ores. In Addition to which, it must be remembered, that two Tons of the Cornish Ore contain as much Metal as five Tons of the Anglesea Ore. *impossible* See the Account annexed to the Anglesea Case.

Q. 6. Have not their Gains for these last five Years been immense, not to say exorbitant?

A. Very far from it; and it is rather astonishing, that the Author of the Answer to the Anglesea Case, who exclaims against creating any Prejudice in the Minds of the Members of Parliament, should throw out a groundless Idea, absolutely calculated to infuse the strongest Prejudices against the present Application for an equitable and impartial Act of the Legislature.

In fine, the Anglesea Miners think it requisite to declare, that they never had any Share in any Monopoly, neither could they be considered as one of the associated Copper Companies in any other Light but that of bringing the Cornish Gentlemen to agree to a fixed reduced Price of the Metal at Market. *but*

R E P L Y,

On the Part of the PROPRIETORS of the
ANGLO-SEA COPPER and LEAD-MINES, to
a Paper called an Answer to their CASE.

1783

